DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 453 RC 013 190

TITLE Migrant Education: The Politics of Building an Education System.
INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, D.C. Div. of Instruction and Professional Development.
PUB DATE Dec 81
NOTE 23p.; Paper copy not available due to publisher preference.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Cooperation; Coordination; *Educational Development; Educational History; *Educational Legislation; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal State Relationship; Government School Relationship; Lobbying; *Migrant Education; Migration; *Political Influences; Politics; *Program Administration; Student Mobility; Student Records
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

Focusing on the roles of organized interest groups and cooperative alliances in constructing a migrant/mobile education system, this paper analyzes the major policy struggles encountered in building the migrant education program during its first 14 years and points out the program's direction for future growth. After a discussion of the basic problems in migrant education, the paper focuses on the impact of various national religious groups, voluntary and professional organizations, and the farm lobby on the development and passage of migrant education legislation. The paper reviews some of the problems and challenges encountered in building an effective delivery system for migrant/mobile education, e.g., identification and recruitment of migrant students and program coordination and continuity. Next, there is a discussion of the struggle over policy control from 1966 to 1974 and the mobilization of support from sources both external and internal to government. The next section highlights the confrontations involving migrant education between 1975 and 1978. The conclusion points out that migrant education must now expand more vigorously into the secondary and postsecondary education fields and indicates the likely areas of confrontation. (CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212453

INSTRUCTION & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION • 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 833-5422

WILLARD H. McGuire, President
BERNIE FREITAG, Vice President
MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL, Secretary-Treasurer

TERRY HERNDON, Executive Director

MIGRANT EDUCATION:

THE POLITICS OF BUILDING AN EDUCATION SYSTEM

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Felton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Instruction and Professional Development
Migrant Education

December 1981

RC 013190

Introduction

This paper will discuss the political and administrative dichotomy in building an education system for the children of migrant farm workers and other mobile populations.

There is a dearth of literature on migrant/mobile education generally, and literature on the politics and administration of migrant education does not exist. The task of this paper is to develop a framework for the study and analysis of the politics and administration of migrant education. It is hoped the framework will bring some cohesion and structure to experiential information accumulated over the fourteen years that migrant education has existed as a specific federal program. The framework is supported by legislative history, administrative memoranda, and position papers.

The primary focus of the paper is on the roles of organized interest groups (pluralism) and cooperative alliances (iron triangles) in constructing a migrant/mobile education system.

Basic Problems in Migrant Education

Migration is a characteristic of all people, and certainly it has survival value for agricultural and other migrant workers and their children. But it creates problems for the American education system, which lacks the readiness and capability to deal with the uniqueness of mobility.

> The tendency of communities is to view migrants as temporary non-residents who come to the area to work during the 'season' with the resulting failure to accept responsibility for educating the children, and when the provision of school personnel and facilities necessary to accommodate large numbers of migrant children imposes a financial burden beyond the means of the local school district.[1]

A basic problem confronting education for migrant and other mobile populations in the United States is that American education is built on the notion that everyone is stationary. Conditions making migration and mobility a problem for society and American education include:

1. Ignoring the mobility factor in planning national, state and local policy for services and programs.
2. The tendency of immobile systems to establish inflexible time frames for delivery of services and programs.
3. The inability of immobile systems to be as dynamic as the sum total of all populations.
4. An insistence that everyone accommodate to immobile systems.[2]

---

[1] Sutton, Elizabeth. "Education of Migrant Children: A Brief History." Original draft, July 22, 1969. pp. 1-2.

[2] "Department of Education, Office of Migrant Education Services - Education for Mobile Populations in America." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, January 1980. p.5.

Another basic problem is the continuing, intense debate relating to federalism, the relationships between national and state governments as prescribed by the Tenth Amendment: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Migrant education, as one of the growing number of federal programs, tests this relationship between federal and state governments.

Building an educational system for migrant and mobile students will require modifications in the traditional educational system. These modifications are necessary to facilitate the integration (flow-through) of migrant and mobile students into the static school environment. But installing these modifications could have constitutional implications. On one hand, local educational agencies (LEAs) have traditionally exercised autonomy in managing public education, as delegated by the states. On the other hand, the role of the federal government is critical for meeting the needs of migrant/mobile individuals because local schools will not or cannot follow these individuals across school, city, or state boundaries.

Most scholars agree that the Constitutional issue has been settled against the states. Many believe the federal government got the upper hand in the midst of the Great Depression and the years following, with the full policy implications not becoming apparent until the 1960's. It was during this period, as James L. Sundquist has written, that:

> ...the American Federal system entered a new phase. Through a series of dramatic enactments, the Congress asserted the national interest and authority in a wide range of governmental functions that until then had been the province exclusively or predominantly of state and local governments.[3]

Federal programs for elementary and secondary education were enacted to address concerns which the Congress felt were not being adequately considered by state or local education agencies. The National Defense Education Act (NDEA),enacted in 1958 in response to the launching of Sputnik by the Soviet Union, represented the major breakthrough in federal aid to education and established the basic categorical structure for laws enacted over the succeeding 20 years.[4] The usually cited constitutional justification for such legislation is the frequently quoted dictum by Justice McKenna in 1913, in Hoke v. United States, in which the Mann White Slave Act was sustained:

> Our dual form of government has its perplexities, State and Nation having different spheres of justification.... but it must be kept in mind that we are one people; and the powers reserved to the states and those conferred on a nation are adapted to be exercised, whether independently or concurrently, to promote the general welfare, material and moral.[5]

Thus, "under present judicial interpretations of the Constitution, especially of the spending power and the commerce clause, the boundaries of possible national action are more and more subject to determination by

---

[3] Reassessment of Federalism: Implications for Education, Background Material. Denver: Education Commission of the States, November 13, 1980. p. 26.

[4] Ibid., p. 37.

[5] U. S. 88th Congress, 1st Session. Federalism: An Introductory Legal Analysis. The Constitution of the USA: Analysis and Interpretation, Senate Document No. 39. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1964. p. 8.

legislative action,"[6] and Congress could address migrant and other concerns that were not provided for adequately by local and state bodies.

A stronger role by the federal government in public policy initially had no impact on the social and economic conditions of migrant agricultural families. The strength of organized farm (owners) interest groups derailed any efforts to include migrant agricultural workers in social and economic legislation.

---

[6] President's Message on the Final Report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 84th Congress, 1st Session, June 28, 1955. p. 59.

Politics and Migrant Education

Composed of the most impoverished people of our nation, the migrant farm labor force has come to be recognized as a group with little voice and no vote in the affairs of their working world or their nation. They work in a system virtually unregulated except for a few narrowly defined state and federal laws. The exclusion of migrant agricultural labor from the major social and economic legislation of the mid 1930's to the early 1960's can be explained within the context of pluralism, or organized interest group influence on public policy. One writer concluded that political realities dictated Congress' course of action.

During this period several national religious groups and national voluntary and professional organizations were giving some attention to the migrant situation. These included the National Child Labor Committee, the Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association, the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, the American Friends Society, the National Council of Churches, the Catholic Rural Life Conference, and the Jewish Agricultural Society.

These groups did advance several initiatives that would create an environment for constructing an educational system for migrant students.

> These initiatives included: increased attention from several Federal Government agencies to the migrant situation; establishment of Interdepartmental and Presidential Committees on Migratory Labor; Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor in 35 states; the United States Office of Education set up a committee of five specialists to look at migrant education; establishment of liaisons

> for migrant education between the Commissioner of Education and each Chief State School Officer; research on interstate migrant education. All of these activities led to the recognition that the Office of Education needed a position of a full-time specialist for the education of migrant students. In 1961, this position was authorized and assigned to the Branch of State and Local Administration. In 1964, one year before the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, when the Office of Education underwent reorganization, this position was assigned to the Division of State Agency Cooperation, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.[7]

Despite the increased interest in elevating the status of migrants as a result of these activities and accomplishments, however, the sponsoring groups were no match for the powerful farm lobby. Over a period of several years, various bills were introduced in Congress intended to provide financial support to local and state education agencies to improve the educational status and general welfare of migrant children and adults, but each in succession was defeated.

It was passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) that finally provided opportunities for migrant agricultural workers to participate in pluralism and policy making. "Politics can be defined as a struggle among forces for the right to control the character of public policy."[8] From the outset, migrant education has been involved in politics.

Migrant Education came into existence in conflict. The major part of ESEA was the Title I allocation for compensatory education, and Congress designated the funds for migrant education be taken off the top of the Title I allocations. But it soon became apparent that serving a mobile population rather

---

[7]Sutton, op. cit., p. 7.

[8]Morrow, William L., Public Administration Politics, Policy and the Political Systems, Second Edition, 1980, p.3.

than a resident population required an entitlement and delivery system distinct from that for regular compensatory education. The highly mobile child is the concern of more than one school district and usually more than one state. The child's "local education agency" is an intrastate, interstate, or interregional segment of the country.

A small group of newly appointed state directors of Title I programs who were committed to serving migrant children were convinced that Title I, especially the funding mechanism, was a statement that ours is a system designed to educate stationary populations and philosophically could not, administratively would not, and programmatically did not provide for mobile student populations. These migrant education advocates were defining what Morrow described: "The mission of nearly every public agency represents a policy preference, a value an expression of intent to do certain things for certain groups. A policy orientation is a source of power for the agency."[9]

Fortunately, because program relationships among federal-state-local agencies under regular Title I programs had not yet stabilized--"State and local agencies were still adjusting to their roles in coping with and accepting new social and economic aspects of education deprivation"[10] --the migrant education advocates had an opportunity to chart a new course and direction. Section 505, Title V, provided for the development of state agency capability for implementing ESEA programs, including interstate cooperation. Utilizing the flexibility in that part of the law, the state directors met in 1966 to discuss basic problems of mobility and to plan strategies for influen-

---

9

10 Migrant Education Program Under Title I ESEA. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, September 23, 1977. p. 4.

cing Congress to amend Title I to include specific language on education for children of migrant agricultural workers. Because the advent of education programs for migrant children presented myriad problems and challenges generally unique in nature and national in scope to educators administrators, and legislators, the meeting also produced long-range strategies for building an efficient and effective delivery system for migrant/mobile education.

The key components included the identification and recruitment of migrant children on their trek around the nation,a records system to transmit critical health and academic information on students as they move from school district to school district and state to state, a funding mechanism that allows the "education dollar" to follow the child, and a mechanism for statewide and interstate program and policy coordination.

Convinced that the mobility of the migrant child was beyond the control of the local education agency, the Congress did amend Title I that same year, and put in place a legislative and administrative wedge in compensatory education, with Title I-Regular and Title I-Migrant (Section 103 of PL 89-750). It placed the responsibility for migrant education program operations at the state and federal levels to ensure program coordination and continuity on statewide and interstate bases. In addition, discretionary and by-pass mechanisms were build into the statute to ensure that services would be available to mobile populations as they moved about the nation.

The Title I state directors who were present at the initial interstate planning meeting in 1966 numbered only six. By 1968, there were 48 state directors or coordinators of migrant education programs.

In 1968, one member of the original advocacy group was appointed administrator of the Migrant Education Branch in the U.S. Office of Education (USOE). The new bureaucracy and its administrator began to deal with what Morrow calls the "two essential missions: (1) The discovery and interpretation of the mission, and (2) The control of internal behavior directed toward implementing such missions." [11] To help in this process the new administrator convened a national planning meeting of all the state directors and coordinators of migrant programs. The planning meeting became a voluntary annual forum on migrant education issues and administrative problems.

This forum might be described best by Norton Long's view on group influence on agency decisions:

> Interests probably get more effective long-term representation through groups.... Therefore, agencies' quests for survival become an effective means of representation, because they lead the agencies to affiliate with groups.[12]

The first national committee the directors formalized was the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS), which was to serve as an ex-officio policy-making body until 1975.

The early building years in migrant education demonstrated that the administrator was aware of the fluctuations in constituency opinon, and that he acted responsibly in faithfully implementing their will and guiding public opinion in directions appropriate to their needs. In short, the administrator and his bureaucracy helped the agency grow through policy expansion.

The struggle over policy control from 1966 to 1974 was concentrated at the elementary education level. Operating in relative obscurity under the guise of an insignificant program ($9 million serving over 40,000 children), the Migrant Education Branch took advantage of the legislative skills of Congressman William

---

[11]Morrow, op. cit., Ch. 3, p. 52.

[12]Morrow, op. cit., p. 3.

William D. Ford (D-Mich.) to further amend ESEA Title I: (1) It extended coverage to migrant children settling out (transition period) of the migrant stream, preschool migrant children, children of migratory fishers, and migratory pulp workers. (2) It established that funds were to be granted on the basis of pupils actually served rather than a per capita basis, established the uniqueness of migrant education by explicitly eliminating the low-income factor used in the Title I-Regular funding formula, and removed the school attendance area definition (target school) used for Title I-Regular. (3) It sanctioned the Migrant Student Record Transfer System a computer network, as an interstate communication system and as a funding mechanism that allowed the "education dollar" to follow the child, and established a mechanism for interstate program and policy coordination.

The voluntary forum of state directors and coordinators of migrant education was formalized in 1975 into the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education. At the same time other external support groups for migrant education began to be recruited into a coalition with the USOE Migrant Education Branch. These included the National Education Association, the Education Commission of the States, the National Coalition for Migrant Education (community-based farm workers groups), and the National Association of HEP and CAMP Directors.[13] Thus, the Migrant Education Branch was implementing Rourke's concept of the "primary mission of an agency as the mobilization of support from sources both external and internal to government." [14] Like other agencies presented with a variety of policy

[13]The High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) are migrant secondary and post-secondary programs originally in the Department of Labor. They have been transferred to the new Department of Education.

[14]Morrow, op. cit., p. 86

barriers, the migrant program looked elsewhere for sustained support for its policies.

Congressman Ford, the congressional dean of migrant education, later superbably stated the politics which underlie the building of migrant education system as chairman of the Interstate Migrant Education Task Force of the Education Commission of the States:

> One of the most appropriate roles for us in education is to create and assure accessibility. It is wonderful to be in a position to stand as a link and protector between human beings and institutions, the government or other individuals...by mobilizing efforts to guarantee a decent future for people who might otherwise be denied it.[15]

From 1975 to 1980 the struggle over policy control has been focused on gaining a separate administrative structure and expanding educational services to preschool and post-secondary migrant students.

The concept and need for a separate administrative structure for migrant education developed at a most opportune period in history. Migrant education had a strong alliance with the National Education Association, the leading interest group in establishing a Department of Education. Thus, the historical and political forces influencing this time span were extremely advantageous to migrant education. The dynamics that gave structure and substance to this period follow.

Following the Education Amendments of 1974 and in response to concerns expressed by directors of state migrant program offices and the National Education Association, hearings were called before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor to review the administrative structure and performance of the Migrant Education

---

[15] Second Interim Report: Findings and Recommendations. Report No. 112. Denver: Education Commission of the States, June 1978. p.v.

Branch. The program was then under the direction of the Title I Division of USOE. The Hearings held November 11 and December 5, 1975, concluded that the Migrant Education Branch had a unique mission and would be most effective if moved out of the Title I Division to a position of greater visibility in USOE. The hearings were followed by an internal administrative audit of the Migrant Education Branch in 1977 and additional congressional hearings in October 1977. The major outcome of these activities was that the Migrant Education Branch was given division status within USOE, equal to Title I, and a recommendation that the staff be increased.

Between 1975 and 1978, concurrent with defining the need for an independent administrative structure, migrant education was involved in three confrontations that illustrate that the Migrant Education Branch had gained considerable confidence for engaging in public policy struggles. These confrontations also verified that the Migrant Education Branch institutionalized its informal relationships with key congressional leaders, particularly Congressman Ford, (chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor), and interest groups supporting migrnat farm worker issues.

The first confrontation was over the issue of five-year eligibility for service to children of migrants settling out of agricultural work, a struggle with the ranking House minority member on the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education. In an attempt to advance his proposal to reduce eligibility from five years to two years, the ranking minority member recruited a colleague to introduce a floor amendment to that effect. The migrant education alliance flooded the recruited congressman's office with telephone calls, cutting off any floor action.

The second issue— to place a "cap" on funds for migrant education--involved a dramatic confrontation with the Title I-Regular bureaucracy. "Capping" these

funds would have done irreparable damage to the development of a migrant education system. The migrant coalition stayed this major attack by Title I-Regular to regain total control over policy. The most articulate statement on this critical issue was presented by Raul de la Rosa, director of Title I programs for the state of Washington. The full of his statement is provided here because it captures the essence of the political and administrative wedge between Title I-Regular and Title I-Migrant.

> Boldly state, migrant children are getting shut off. The Migrant Education Program of Title I was created because the benefits of the basic Title I program were simply not reaching migrant children. These kids were not, and are not, part of the mainstream of local school districts and the communities they serve. They are often viewed as outsiders and not within the school's area of responsibility Thus, migrants are the invisible working poor and, because of the pattern of uprootedness in their lives, their extreme poverty, housing and health care needs, their educational needs are intensified.
>
> Point I: Putting a cap on the migrant program will set a bad precedent for funding. The Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) has made great strides in recent years in identifying and tracking migrant students so that they will receive an adequate education. Each year, since the establishement of MSRTS, the program has grown by about 20 percent. It currently serves 494,417 children, 0-21 years of age. A static appropriation will mean that local school districts will have no incentive to locate, serve and place new children on MSRTS. In addition, the per-pupil expenditure for those children now being served will decline.
>
> Point II: While the Administration is trying to hold the dollars static, there has been an expansion in the number of children eligible for services, one statutory and one regulatory. The Education Amendments of 1978 added children of migrant parents involved in the timber industry. Also, the latest regulations issued from the U.S. Office of Education emphasize serving pre-school children that do not bring in dollars. Last year 62,000 pre-schoolers were served. But serving children that do not generate dollars is getting more and more difficult as the money squeeze is felt. And, this is the only Title I program where, due to MSRTS, need projections are based on the exact number of children rather than on estimates as with other programs. As a matter of fact, the dollars are not even based on individual children, but on full-time equivalent students. Therefore, there are always more children served than are funded.

Point III: The Administration has claimed that because they are holding the Title I Basic Grant Program level and because migrant education and other state agency programs come off the top of the Title I appropriation, they feel compelled to put a cap on these programs. This action is really a contradiction. One of the key roles the federal government claims for itself in education is insuring equal educational opportunity and providing aid to the disadvantaged. Yet, when priorities are being set in the interest of fiscal constraint, the federal budget does not reflect this primary function. Title I is the largest program aiding the disadvantaged. Yet, when priorities are being set in the interest of fiscal constraint, the federal budget does not reflect this primary function. Title I is the largest program aiding the disadvantaged in elementary and secondary education. Instead of holding this program level and thereby reducing it through inflation this, among all federal education programs, should have shown an increase. Because they have allowed no increase in the program and have instead responded by requesting a cap on migrant education moneys, they in effect rob poor Peter to pay poor Paul.

Point IV: A supplemental request for FY 79 and a request for FY 80 for Title I Concentration Grants requested by the Administration would benefit basic Title I children in urban areas. Migrant children will never see any of the benefits of this increase.[16]

A third issue displaying the growing strength and sophistication of the migrant education alliance—the "iron triangle"-- dealt with the transfer of the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) from the Department of Labor (DOL) to the new Department of Education. HEP and CAMP were administered by DOL under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and were scheduled to be defunded on DOL's recommendation. Organized migrant interest groups collaborated with congressional staffs to send a joint letter from Congress (66 representatives and 20 senators affixed their signatures) to the Secretary of Labor to cease any action on HEP and CAMP.

When the House of Representatives amended the Higher Education Act in 1976, it directed the Secretary of Labor to see to it that HEP and CAMP would

---

[16]Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. "Migrant Education-Appropriation Alert." Olympia, Washington: The Office, April 17, 1979. 2 pp. (Prepared by Raul de la Rosa).

continue to receive direct funding. The Committee report stated:

> On this issue, the Committee believes it is merely reinforcing what the House has already directed the Secretary to do.
>
> This section also requires the Commissioner of Education in conjunction with the Secretary of Labor, to study these programs and submit to the Congress recommendations for strengthening the programs, increasing the cost-effectiveness, improving the administration, increasing the enrollment and involvement of migrant and seasonal farm workers in the programs...
>
> The Committee expects that the study will draw heavily upon the expertise and insights of private organizations that have demonstrated a concern for the interests of migrant and seasonal farm workers.[17]

The HEP and CAMP issue allowed the Migrant Education Branch to define and expand its mission beyond the secondary education level. For the first time, the migrant education alliance began to contemplate the building of a comprehensive migrant/mobile education system.

Two additional parts of the legislative chronology show Congress ascribing greater comprehensiveness and responsiveness to the education of migrant students and bring to culmination its intent "to meet the needs of transients in education and educationally related matters on a continuing basis."[18] (1) The Higher Education Amendments of 1980 provide specifc language and funds for migrant agricultural students, including HEP and CAMP. (2) Section 303 (a) of the Department of Education Organization Act established an Office of Migrant Education.

Section 303 (a), in particular, "is clear evidence that Congress has understood and given importance to the unique mission of migrant education. It is a

---

[17] 94th. Congress, 2nd Session. Higher Education Amendments of 1976. Report to accompany H.R. 12851. Washington, D.C.: House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, 1976. p. 25.

[18] Senate Report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967.

mission which cannot be subject to the restrictions and limitations imposed by static education systems and traditional educational thinking. The development of educational programs for mobile Americans is a new horizon in the history of American education."[19]

Congressman William D. Ford's remarks before the House on Section 303 (a), close out a history of political and administrative struggle, and herald an era of conflict and challenge:

> It is my expectation that the new Department of Education will establish a single office to administer and coordinate a comprehensive educational delivery system for migrant children so that they will have equal access to quality education at every level. The transfer of these programs (HEP and CAMP) at that time will provide the capstone to the approach embodied in the Title I migrant education program.[20]

Much of the success of migrant education during its first fourteen years can be attributed to the technical expertise and responsive and responsible management of policy descretion by the administrator of migrant education. Long's description of administrators is quite appropriate for the new Deputy Assistant Secretary for Migrant Education:

> ... administrators not only implement policies but also consciously fuse administration with politics by utilizing policy descretion to form power alliances with external forces. [21]

---

[19]"Department of Education, Office of Migrant Education Services-Education for Mobile Populations in America." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, January 1980, p. 11.

[20]Congressional Record-House, June 13, 1979. p. H4460

[21]Morrow, op. cit., Ch. 4, p. 3.

The Unfinished Politics of Migrant Education

In addition to maintaining and continuing the development and implementation of the original strategies (1966), the migrant education bureaucracy must plan and accommodate new policy and strategies.

The first fourteen years of migrant education have been dominated by elementary education. Now the bureaucracy must expand as dynamically into secondary education, which is part of its original legislation. The new Office of Migrant Education and the migrant education amendment to the Higher Education Act further expand the mission into post-secondary education. The dominance of elementary education professionals might create a problem in that it fosters an inability and insensitivity by the Office of Migrant Education and the state migrant education programs for designing, implementing, and managing secondary and post-secondary migrant education programs. This inability and insensitivity is manifest in the tenuous relationship that exists between the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education and the National Association of HEP and CAMP Directors. How this critical relationship is ultimately resolved may determine whether or not the Office of Migrant Education is capable of meeting the intent of Congress, to administer and coordinate a comprehensive educational delivery system for migrant and mobile students.

The migrant education bureaucracy will be confronted again by the federalism issue as it designs and constructs the secondary and post-secondary segments

of the migrant/mobile education system. The confrontation will likely focus on two factors: (1) The problem of secondary credit exchange will be seen as a direct intervention in state requirements for graduation. (2) The new political environment will be more sympathetic to, and even encourage, the federalism strategy.

On the other hand, the Migrant Education bureaucracy has the opportunity to use the new spirit of federalism to create state legislation and policy that will anchor the national migrant education system. Currently, no state has passed legislation or allocated funds to provide for the education of migrant/mobile students attending schools within their borders. The national need and strategy will continue to be the expansion of the migrant education mission to include other mobile populations.

Conclusion

Analysis of the major policy struggles in building a migrant/mobile education system indicates that migrant education has been reasonably effective within the context of the politics and administration dichotomy. Evidence shows that the migrant education bureaucracy has shared in the responsibility for the public promotion of policy and in mobilizing biases for its survival and growth. It is apparent that the Office of Migrant Education has begun to acquire characteristics of power as described by Norton Long:

1. Agencies have a special competence in the technical aspects of their fields which of necessity gives them a rightful policy initiative.

2. In addition, they have or develop a shrewd understanding of the politically feasible in the group structure within which they work.

3. Above all, in the eyes of their supporters and their enemies they represent the institutionalized embodiment of policy, and enduring organization actually or potentially capable of mobilizing power behind policy.[22]

More detailed analysis will be required to determine the potential and ability of the Office of Migrant Education to expand its support base, which is necessary for building an education system to serve every mobile student.

---

[22]Long, Norton E. "Power and Administration." Public Administration Review. 9: 259-64; Autumn 1949.

Bibliography

Education Commission of the States, Interstate Migrant Education Task Force. Second Interim Report: Findings and Recommendations. Report No. 112. Denver: the Commission, Novermber 1978. 24 pp.

Education Commission of the States. Reassessment of Federalism: Implications for Education. Denver: the Commission, November 13, 1980. 64 p..

Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service. Migrant Education Program Under Title I ESEA. Washington, D.C.: the Library, September 23, 1977.

Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service. The Migrant Farm Workers Situation in the U.S.: The Problems and Programs. Washington, D.C.: the Library, April 17, 1975.

Morrow, William L. Public Administration: Politics, Policy and Political Systems. Second Edition. New York: Random House, 1980. 360 pp.

National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children. Wednesday's Children. A Report on Programs Funded Under the Migrant Amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. New York: the Committee, 1971. 132 pp.

National Education Association. "Department of Education, Office of Migrant Education Services—Education for Mobile Populations in America. Washington, D.C.: the Association, January 1980. 11 pp.

Pyecha, J. N. ; Clayton, C. A.; and Thomas C. L. Strategy for Evaluating the Cognitive Impact of the ESEA Title I Migrant Program at the National and State Levels. Executive Summary. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Center for Educational Research, Triangle Institute, March 1978. 25 pp.

Sutton, Elizabeth. "Education of Migrant Children: A Brief History." Original draft, July 22, 1969. p. 1-7.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. "Grants to state Educational Agencies to Meet the Special Educational Needs of Migratory Children." Federal Register, Part VI, Vol. 45, No. 66, April 3, 1980. Subpart A, 116d.1, p. 22662.

U. S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. (Committee Print) Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1979, 52 pp.

U. S. 95th Congress, 2nd Session. H.R. 18890: The Education Act of 1978. Washington, D.C.: House of Representatives, February 9, 1978.